arXiv:1510.04924v1 [q-fin.RM] 16 Oct 2015

OPTIMAL INVESTMENT IN A DUAL RISK MODEL

ARASH FAHIM AND LINGJIONG ZHU

Abstract. Dual risk models are popular for modeling a venture capital or high tech company, for which the running cost is deterministic and the profits arrive stochastically over time. Most of the existing literature on dual risk models concentrated on the optimal dividend strategies. In this paper, we propose to study the optimal investment strategy on research and development for the dual risk models to minimize the ruin probability of the underlying company. We will also study the optimization problem when in addition the investment in a risky asset is allowed.

1. Introduction

The classical Cramér-Lundberg model, or the classical compound Poisson risk model says that the surplus process of an insurance company follows the dynamics:

$$dX_t = \rho dt - dJ_t, \qquad X_0 = x > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\rho > 0$ is the premium rate and $J_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} Y_i$ is a compound Poisson process, where N_t is a Poisson process with intensity $\lambda > 0$ and claim sizes Y_i are i.i.d. positive random variables independent of the Poisson process with $\mathbb{E}[Y_1] < \infty$. One central question in the ruin theory is to study the ruin probability $\mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty)$, where $\tau := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t < 0\}$.

In recent years, there have been a lot of studies in the insurance and finance literature on the so-called dual risk model, see e.g. [1, 4, 3, 6, 10, 11, 22, 23, 26, 29, 32], with wealth process following the dynamics:

$$dX_t = -\rho dt + dJ_t, \qquad X_0 = x > 0, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\rho > 0$ is the cost of running the company and $J_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} Y_i$, is the stream of profits, where Y_i are i.i.d. $\mathbb{R}^+$ valued random variables with common probability density function $p(y)$, $y > 0$ and N_t is a Poisson process with intensity $\lambda > 0$. The dual risk model is used to model the wealth of a venture capital, whose profits depend on the research and development. The classical risk model (1.1) is most often interpreted as the surplus of an insurance company. On the other hand, the dual risk model (1.2) can be understood as the wealth of a venture capital or high tech company. The analogue of the premium in the classical model is the running cost in the dual model, and the claims become the future profits of the company.

One of the most fundamental question in the dual risk model is the optimal dividend strategies. Avanzi et al. [4] worked on optimal dividends in the dual risk model where the optimal strategy is a barrier strategy. Avanzi et al. [3] studied a dividend barrier strategy for the dual risk model whereby dividend decisions are

Date: 16 October 2015. *Revised:* 16 October 2015.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 62P05;91B30;93E20.
Key words and phrases. dual risk model, minimizing ruin probability, optimal investment.

made only periodically, but still allow ruin to occur at any time. A dual model with a threshold dividend strategy, with exponential interclaim times was studied in Ng [22]. Afonso et al. [1] also worked on dividend problem in the dual risk model, assuming exponential interclaim times. A new approach for the calculation of expected discounted dividends was presented and ruin and dividend probabilities, number of dividends, time to a dividend, and the distribution for the amount of single dividends were studied. Dividend moments in the dual risk model were considered in Cheung and Drekic [11]. They derived integro-differential equations for the moments of the total discounted dividends which can be solved explicitly assuming the jump size distribution has a rational Laplace transform. The expected discounted dividends assuming the profits follow a Phase Type distribution were studied in Rodríguez et al. [26] . The Laplace transform of the ruin time, expected discounted dividends for the Sparre-Andersen dual model were derived in Yang and Sendova [29].

So far the optimization problems studied in the literature on dual risk models are almost exclusively devoted to the optimal dividend strategy. In this paper, we consider a different type of optimization problem. For a venture capital, or a high tech company, the investment strategy on research and development (R&D) is crucial. A decision to increase the investment on research and development will increase the running cost of the company, but that will also boost the possibility of the future profits. Therefore, we believe that it is of fundamental interest to understand the optimal investment strategy to strengthen the position of the company.

It is well known that research and development is a basic engine of economic and social growth. It is a considerable amount of spending among many leading corporations in the world. A 2014 FORTUNE article listed the top ten biggest R&D spenders worldwide in the year 2013, including Volkswagen, Samsung, Intel, Microsoft, Roche, Novartis, Toyota, Johnson & Johnson, Google and Merck, with Intel spent as much as 20.1% of their revenue on R&D, see [9]. Many technology giants increase their R&D spending consistently, year over year, see e.g. Table 1 for the R&D and percentage of the revenues of Google in the years 2011-2014[1]. Notice that in the case of Google, even though the R&D expenditure increases year by year, it increases in line with the increase of the total revenues so that as the percentage of revenues, the number does not change much. For some companies, both the absolute R&D expenditure amount and the percentage as the revenues remain reasonably stable, see e.g. Table 2 for Merck in the years 2011-2014 [2]. For some companies, both the absolute R&D expenditure amount and the percentage as the revenues can change dramatically, see e.g. Table 3 for Tesla in the years 2011-2014 [3]. The case of Tesla is exceptional but not unusual for a new high-tech company in the sense the in the fiscal year 2011, the R&D expenditure exceeded the total revenues. Another company that has enjoyed similar phenomenal growth as Tesla is the Facebook, see Table 4. But Facebook's spending on R&D is not as aggressive as Tesla.

Since it is expensed rather than capitalized, cuts on research and development increases in profit in the short term, but it can hurt the strength of a company in the long run, even if the detrimental impact of the cuts may not be felt for a few years.

[1]Available on `https://investor.google.com/financial/tables.html`

[2]Available on Google Finance at `https://www.google.com/finance`

[3]Available on Google Finance at `https://www.google.com/finance`

In the most recent recession, firms with revenues greater than 100 million USD reduced their research and development intensity (divided by revenue) by 5.6%, even though the advertising intensity actually increased 3.4%, see [19]. In the long run, the research and development does help the company grow and increase the value of a company. Using a measure of the so-called research quotient, a study over all publicly traded US companies from 1981 through 2006 suggested that a 10% increase in research quotient, results an increase in market value of 1.1%, see [19]. Indeed, the US government also encourages the research and development activities. The Research & Experimentation Tax Credit, is a general business tax credit passed by the Congress in 1981, as a response to the concerns that research spending declines had adversely affected the country's economic growth, productivity gains, and competitiveness within the global marketplace. According to a study by Ernst & Young, in the year 2005, 17,700 US corporations claimed 6.6 billion USD R&D tax credits on their tax returns[4].

Full Year	2011	2012	2013	2014
R&D (millions)	\$5,162	\$6,083	\$7,137	\$9,832
Revenues (millions)	\$37,905	\$46,039	\$55,519	\$66,001
As % of Revenues	14%	13%	13%	15%

TABLE 1. R&D spending by Google during 2011-2014.

Full Year	2011	2012	2013	2014
R&D (millions)	\$7,742	\$7,911	\$7,123	\$6,897
Revenues (millions)	\$48,047	\$47,267	\$44,033	\$42,237
As % of Revenues	16%	17%	16%	16%

TABLE 2. R&D spending by Merck during 2011-2014.

Full Year	2011	2012	2013	2014
R&D (millions)	\$209	\$274	\$232	\$465
Revenues (millions)	\$204	\$413	\$2,014	\$3,198
As % of Revenues	102%	66%	12%	15%

TABLE 3. R&D spending by Tesla during 2011-2014.

Full Year	2011	2012	2013	2014
R&D (millions)	\$388	\$1,399	\$1,415	\$2,666
Revenues (millions)	\$3711	\$5089	\$7872	\$12466
As % of Revenues	10%	27%	18%	21%

TABLE 4. R&D spending by Facebook during 2011-2014.

[4]See Supporting innovation and economic growth: The broad impact of the R&D credit in 2005. Prepared by Ernst & Young LLP for the R&D Coalition. April 2008. Available at `http://investinamericasfuture.org/PDFs/R&DTaxCreditStudy2008final.pdf`

To the best of our knowledge, the optimal investment in research and development for the dual risk model has never been studied. There are only a limited number of works on the optimal venture capital investments, see e.g. [6].

In addition to the investment in research and development, we will also allow the investment in a risky asset, e.g. a market index. The possibility that an insurer can invest part of the surplus into a risky asset to minimize the ruin probability has been studied by Browne [8] for the case that the insurance business is modelled by a Brownian motion with constant drift and the risky asset is modelled as a geometric Brownian motion. Later, Hipp and Plum [18] studied the optimal investment in a market index for insurers in the classical compound Poisson risk model. We will study the the optimal investment problem when both investment in research and development and investment in a risky asset are allowed. Unlike the problem of minimizing the ruin probability for an insurer in the classical risk model [18], we will obtain closed-form formulas in the dual risk model.

Since the works of Browne [8] and Hipp and Plum [18], the optimal investment in the market for the classical risk model and related models have been extensively studied. In Liu and Yang [20], they generalized the works by Hipp and Plum [18] by including a risk-free asset. In Schmidli [27], the optimization problem of minimizing the ruin probability for the classical risk model is studied when investment in a risky assent and proportional reinsurance are both allowed. The asymptotic ruin probability for the classical risk model under the optimal investment in a risky asset is obtained by Gaier et al. [15] for large initial wealth. The asymptotics for small claim sizes were obtained in Hipp [17]. In Yang and Zhang [30], they studied the optimal investment for an insurer when the risk process is compound Poisson process perturbed by a standard Brownian motion and the insurer can invest in the money market and in a risky asset. In Gaier and Grandits [13], the case when the claim sizes are of regularly varying tails were studied. The results were then extended to include interest rates in [14]. The case for subexponential claims was investigaed in Schmidli [28]. In Promislow and Young [25], they studied the problem of minimizing the probability of ruin of an insurer when the claim process is modeled by a Brownian motion with drift optimizing over the investment in a risky asset and purchasing quota-share reinsurance. In Wang et al. [31], they adopted the martingale approach to study the optimal investment problem for an insurer when the insurer's risk process is modeled by a Lévy process with possible investment in a security market described by the standard Black-Scholes model. When the underlying investor is an individual rather than an insurance company, the optimal investment problem of minimizing the ruin probability was studied in e.g. Bayraktar and Young [7]. In Azcue and Muler [5], they studied the minimization of the ruin probability for the classical risk model with possible investment in a risky asset that follows a geometric Brownian motion under the borrowing constraints. There have been many other works in this area. For a survey, we refer to Paulsen [24] and the references therein.

This paper is organized as follows. We first study the optimal investment strategy on research and development to minimize the ruin probability of the company. Then, we generalize our results to a state-dependent dual risk model that was first introduced in Zhu [32]. When the size of a company increases, the cost usually also increases, while the resource of income will also increase in general, which makes it natural to study a state-dependent dual risk model. Next, we will study and

optimal investment strategy so that in addition to the investment in the research and development, the investment in a risky asset, e.g. a capital market index is allowed. Finally, we will do some numerical studies to understand better how the minimized ruin probability and the optimal strategy depend on the parameters in the model.

2. Minimizing the Ruin Probability

The management of the underlying company can decide whether or not to increase the capital spending on research and development to boost the future profits. Our goal is to find the optimal expenditure on research and development to minimize the probability that the company is eventually ruined.

Let $\tau := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \leq 0\}$ be the ruin time. The eventual ruin probability is defined as a function of the initial wealth x: $\psi(x) := \mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty | X_0 = x)$.

Note that under the assumption $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] > \rho$, the ruin probability $\psi(x)$ is less than 1. Indeed, $\psi(x) = e^{-\alpha x}$, where $\alpha > 0$ is the unique solution to the equation:

$$\rho\alpha + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Now, let us introduce the idiosyncratic cost $C_t > 0$ associated with the investment in research and development. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of all admissible strategies, defined as

$$\mathcal{C} := \Big\{ C : [0,\infty) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : C \text{ is progressively measurable, bounded and predictable} \Big\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Given $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$, the intensity of the arrival process of the profits is assumed to be

$$\lambda_t^C = \lambda + \delta C_t^\gamma, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\delta > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$. Given $C_t \in \mathcal{C}$, the wealth process $X_t =: X_t^C$ satisfies the dynamics:

$$dX_t^C = -(\rho + C_t)dt + dJ_t^C, \qquad X_0^C = x, \tag{2.4}$$

where $J_t^C = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t^C} Y_i$ and N_t^C is a simple point process with intensity λ_t^C at time t.

Notice when $\gamma > 1$, for any constant strategy $C_t \equiv C$, where $C > 0$ is sufficiently large, the ruin probability is given by $e^{-\alpha_C x}$, where α_C is the unique positive solution to the equation:

$$(\rho + C)\alpha_C + (\lambda + \delta C^\gamma) \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha_C y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{2.5}$$

We can rewrite this equation as:

$$\frac{\rho + C}{\lambda + \delta C^\gamma}\alpha_C = \int_0^\infty [1 - e^{-\alpha_C y}]p(y)dy. \tag{2.6}$$

The right hand side of the above equation is bounded between 0 and 1. In the left hand side of the above equation, $\lim_{C\to\infty} \frac{\rho+C}{\delta C^\gamma} = 0$, which implies that $\alpha_C \to \infty$ as $C \to \infty$. Hence, $V(x) \leq \inf_{C>0} e^{-\alpha_C x} = 0$ and the minimized ruin probability is trivially zero.

Therefore, for the rest of the paper, we only consider two cases: (i) $0 < \gamma < 1$; (ii) $\gamma = 1$.

2.1. **The $0 < \gamma < 1$ Case.** Let us first assume that $0 < \gamma < 1$. Therefore, λ_t is a concave function of C_t. What it says is that the initial investment of research and development can boost the prospect of future profits, but the margin decreases as the increase of the investment.

We are interested to study the following stochastic optimal control problem:

$$V(x) := \inf_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty | X_0 = x), \tag{2.7}$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of all non-negative $\mathcal{F}_t$ measurable functions C_t that satisfies $\sup_t C_t < \infty$.

We know that if we choose $C(\cdot) \equiv 0$, $\psi(x) = e^{-\alpha x} < 1$ under the condition $\lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1] > \rho$ and thus $V(x) < 1$.

Notice that our assumptions that ρ and λ are constant might be too simplified to model the running costs and profits of a real company, especially when the underlying company is a relatively new high tech company for which the revenues and R&D expenditure can change a lot over time, see e.g. Table 1, Table 3. But for a more mature company, the revenues and R&D are usually more stable, see e.g. Table 2. So our oversimplified assumptions can still provide us some insight to this optimization problem, especially since it will leads to analytical tractability. Later, we will also consider the case when ρ, λ etc. depend on the state of the process X_t.

Indeed, when it is allowed to invest in research and development, we will see later, that the condition

$$(\rho - \lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1]) - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1 \right) (\mathbb{E}[Y_1])^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} < 0 \tag{2.8}$$

is sufficient to guarantee that $V(x) < 1$. Note that this is weaker than the usual condition $\rho - \lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1] < 0$ for the dual risk model.

It is easy to see that $V(x)$ satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation:

$$\inf_{C>0} \left\{ -(\rho + C)V'(x) + (\lambda + \delta C^\gamma) \int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)] p(y) dy \right\} = 0, \tag{2.9}$$

with boundary condition $V(0) = 1$.

Lemma 1. *Under the assumption* (2.8)*, $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$ is a solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation* (2.9)*, where β is the unique positive value that satifies the equation:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta \left[\rho + \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y} p(y) dy} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \right] \\ &\quad - \left[\lambda + \delta \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y} p(y) dy} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \right] \left(1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y} p(y) dy \right) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Given $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, and the

$$C^* := \operatorname{argmin} \{ (-(\rho + C)V'(x) + (\lambda + \delta C^\gamma) \int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)] p(y) dy \} \tag{2.11}$$

is given by

$$C^* = \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \tag{2.12}$$

and it also satisfies the equation:

$$\lambda + (1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma = \rho\delta\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1}. \tag{2.13}$$

Proof. Minimizing over C in the equation (2.9), we get

$$-V'(x) + \delta\gamma C^{\gamma-1}\int_0^\infty [V(x+y)-V(x)]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{2.14}$$

Note that C is positive and $V(x)$ is decreasing in x. Hence,

$$C = \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{V'(x)}{\int_0^\infty [V(x+y)-V(x)]p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \tag{2.15}$$

and the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &-\left[\rho + \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{V'(x)}{\int_0^\infty [V(x+y)-V(x)]p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\right] V'(x) \\ &\quad + \left[\lambda + \delta\left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{V'(x)}{\int_0^\infty [V(x+y)-V(x)]p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\right] \\ &\quad\quad \cdot \int_0^\infty [V(x+y)-V(x)]p(y)dy = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

We can see that $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, where $\beta > 0$ is the unique solution to the equation:

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta\left[\rho + \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\right] \\ &\quad - \left[\lambda + \delta\left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\right]\left(1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy\right) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} F(\beta) := &\beta\left[\rho + \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\right] \\ &- \left[\lambda + \delta\left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\right]\left(1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

We want to show that there exists a unique positive value β such that $F(\beta) = 0$. For the convenience, let us also introduce the notation:

$$g(\beta) := \frac{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}{\beta}. \tag{2.19}$$

It is easy to compute that for $\beta > 0$,

$$g'(\beta) = \frac{1}{\beta^2} \int_0^\infty \left[\beta y e^{-\beta y} - 1 + e^{-\beta y}\right] p(y) dy. \tag{2.20}$$

Let $h(x) = xe^{-x} - 1 + e^{-x}$, $x \geq 0$. Then $h(0) = 0$ and $h(x) \to -1$ as $x \to \infty$. Moreover, $h'(x) = -xe^{-x} < 0$ for $x > 0$. Thus $h(x) \leq 0$ for any $x \geq 0$ and therefore, $g(\beta)$ is a decreasing function of β.

Note that we can rewrite $F(\beta)$ as

$$F(\beta) = \beta \left[\rho - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) [g(\beta)]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} - \lambda g(\beta)\right]. \tag{2.21}$$

Therefore, $F(\beta) = 0$ for $\beta > 0$ if and only if $G(\beta) = 0$ for $\beta > 0$, where

$$G(\beta) := \rho - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) [g(\beta)]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} - \lambda g(\beta). \tag{2.22}$$

Note that by L'Hôpital's rule,

$$\lim_{\beta \to 0^+} g(\beta) = \mathbb{E}[Y_1]. \tag{2.23}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\beta \to 0^+} G(\beta) = (\rho - \lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1]) - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) (\mathbb{E}[Y_1])^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} < 0. \tag{2.24}$$

On the other hand, $g(\beta) \to 0$ as $\beta \to \infty$, therefore $G(\beta) \to \rho > 0$ as $\beta \to \infty$. Since $g(\beta)$ is a decreasing function in β and $0 < \gamma < 1$, it follows that $G(\beta)$ is increasing in β. Hence, we conclude that $G(\beta) = 0$ has a unique positive solution.

Given $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, then we have:

$$C^* = \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y} p(y) dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}. \tag{2.25}$$

Recall the definition of $G(\beta)$ in (2.22) and β satisfies $G(\beta) = 0$. Therefore the optimal C^* in (2.25) must satisfy the equation:

$$\lambda + (1-\gamma)\delta (C^*)^\gamma = \rho\delta\gamma (C^*)^{\gamma-1}. \tag{2.26}$$

□

Example 2. *When $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$, $\nu > 0$, β satisfies*

$$\beta \left[\rho + \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (\beta+\nu)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\right] = \left[\lambda + \delta \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} (\beta+\nu)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\right] \frac{\beta}{\beta+\nu}, \tag{2.27}$$

which implies that

$$\rho(\beta+\nu) = \lambda + \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} (\beta+\nu)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}. \tag{2.28}$$

In particular, when $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$, we get

$$\rho(\beta+\nu)^2 = \lambda(\beta+\nu) + \frac{\delta^2}{4}, \tag{2.29}$$

and therefore

$$\beta = \frac{\lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 + \rho\delta^2}}{2\rho} - \nu, \tag{2.30}$$

and the optimal C^* is given by

$$C^* = \frac{\delta^2\rho^2}{(\lambda+\sqrt{\lambda^2+\rho\delta^2})^2}. \tag{2.31}$$

2.1.1. *A Verification Theorem.* Let us recall that

$$\inf_{C\geq 0}\left\{-(\rho+C)V'(x)+(\lambda+\delta C^\gamma)\int_0^\infty [V(x+y)-V(x)]p(y)dy\right\}=0, \tag{2.32}$$

with $V(0)=1$. Given $C\in\mathcal{C}$, the wealth process satisfies the dynamics:

$$dX_t^c = -(\rho+C_t)dt + dJ_t^C \text{ and } X_0^C = x.$$

Theorem 3 (Verification)**.** *Let $w\in \mathrm{C}^1_{\mathrm{b}}$ be solution of* (2.32) *such that for any $C\in\mathcal{C}$*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} w(X_t^C)1_{\{t\leq\tau\}} = 0 \text{ a.s.} \tag{2.33}$$

Then, $w\leq V$. In addition, if there exists a bounded function $C^*:\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\to\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$C^*(x)\in \operatorname{argmin}_{C\geq 0}\left\{-(\rho+C)w'(x)+(\lambda+\delta C^\gamma)\int_0^\infty [w(x+y)-w(x)]p(y)dy\right\},$$

and $dX_t^* = -(\rho+C^*(X_t^*))dt + dJ_t^{C^*(X_{t-}^*)}$ has a solution, then, $w=V$.

Proof. Since w is bounded and continuously differentiable with bounded derivative, by Itô lemma for jump processes we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[w(X_{t\wedge\tau}^C)] = w(x) + \mathbb{E}\Bigg[\int_0^{t\wedge\tau}\Bigg(&-(\rho+C_s)w'(X_s^c)\\ &+(\lambda+\delta C_s^\gamma)\int_0^\infty [w(X_s^C+y)-w(X_s^C)]p(y)dy\Bigg)ds\Bigg]\\ \geq w(x),\end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

for any $C\in\mathcal{C}$. Therefore,

$$w(x)\leq \mathbb{E}[w(X_{t\wedge\tau}^C)] = \mathbb{E}[w(X_t^C)1_{\{t<\tau\}}+1_{\{t\geq\tau\}}].$$

If follows from (2.33) and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem that the right hand side above converges to $\mathbb{P}(\tau<\infty)$ and

$$w(x)\leq \mathbb{P}(\tau<\infty).$$

By taking infimum over $C\in\mathcal{C}$, we obtain $w\leq V$. To obtain the equality, notice that in the above argument we have equality when $C_t = C^*(X_{t-}^*)$ □

Corollary 4. *$V(x)=e^{-\beta x}$ where β is the unique solution to the equation* (2.17)*.*

Proof. It is sufficient to show that for any $C\in\mathcal{C}$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\exp(-\beta X_t^C)1_{\{t\leq\tau\}} = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

Notice that the event that the above limit is not zero is included in $\bigcup_{L\in\mathbb{N}}\{\omega : \liminf_{t\to\infty} X_t^C < L \text{ and } \tau=\infty\}$. Since C is bounded, given $X_t^C = x$ for $x\in[0,L]$, the probability that X_{t+h}^C has no jumps during any bounded time interval $[t,t+h_0]$ is positive. More specifically, the probability that $X_{t+h}^C = x-(\rho t+\int_0^t C_s ds)$ for all $h\in[0,x/\rho]$ is positive number. In other words, if $\liminf_{t\to\infty} X_t^C < L$ then

ruin eventually occurs. This implies that $\mathbb{P}(\liminf_{t\to\infty} < L,\ \tau = \infty) = 0$ which completes the proof. □

2.1.2. *Asymptotic Analysis.*

Remark 5. *We have already showed that $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, where β is the unique positive solution to the equation (2.17) and that is equivalent to $G(\beta) = 0$, i.e.,*

$$\rho - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right)[g(\beta)]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} - \lambda g(\beta) = 0. \tag{2.35}$$

Now, let us discuss how the value β (and hence the value function $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$) and the optimal investment rate C^* depend on the parameters ρ, λ and δ. By (2.35), we have the following observations:

(i) As ρ increases, $g(\beta)$ increases. Since $g(\beta)$ is decreasing in β, we conclude that β decreases as ρ increases. Intuitively it says that as the fixed running cost for research and investment increases, the ruin probability increases. Asymptotically, as $\rho \to 0$, $g(\beta) \to 0$. When $g(\beta) \to 0$, since $0 < \gamma < 1$, we must have $[g(\beta)]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \ll g(\beta)$. Therefore, by (2.35), as $\rho \to 0$, we have $g(\beta) \sim \frac{\rho}{\lambda}$. From the definition of $g(\beta)$, we have $g(\beta) \sim \frac{1}{\beta}$ as $\beta \to \infty$. Hence, we conclude that

$$\beta \sim \frac{\lambda}{\rho}, \qquad \text{as } \rho \to 0. \tag{2.36}$$

Therefore, the optimal C^* satisfies

$$C^* \sim (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}\left(\frac{\rho}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}, \qquad \text{as } \rho \to 0. \tag{2.37}$$

(ii) As δ increases, $g(\beta)$ decreases. Since $g(\beta)$ is decreasing in β, we conclude that β increases as δ increases. Intuitively, it says that if the prospect of future profits given the investment in research and development increases, then the ruin probability decreases. Asymptotically, as $\delta \to \infty$, we have $g(\beta) \to 0$, and therefore as $\delta \to \infty$,

$$(\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right)[g(\beta)]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \to \rho, \tag{2.38}$$

which implies that as $\delta \to \infty$, we have

$$g(\beta) \sim \frac{\rho^{1-\gamma}}{\gamma\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right)^{1-\gamma}}\frac{1}{\delta}. \tag{2.39}$$

Since $g(\beta) \sim \frac{1}{\beta}$ as $\beta \to \infty$, we conclude that

$$\beta \sim \frac{\gamma\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right)^{1-\gamma}}{\rho^{1-\gamma}}\delta, \qquad \text{as } \delta \to \infty. \tag{2.40}$$

Moreover, the optimal C^* satisfies:

$$C^* \to \frac{\rho}{\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1}, \qquad \text{as } \delta \to \infty. \tag{2.41}$$

Now, if $\delta \to 0$, then $g(\beta) \to \frac{\rho}{\lambda}$. Therefore, as $\delta \to 0$, $\beta \to \alpha$, where we recall that α is the unique positive value so that

$$1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha y}p(y)dy = \alpha\frac{\rho}{\lambda}. \tag{2.42}$$

which is the same as defined in (2.1)*. Moreover, the optimal* C^* *satisfies*

$$C^* \sim (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{\rho}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}, \qquad \text{as } \delta \to 0. \tag{2.43}$$

Intuitively, it says that as $\delta \to 0$*, there is no value investing in research and development.*

(iii) Similarly, as λ *increases,* β *increases, and the ruin probability decreases. As* $\lambda \to \infty$*, we have* $g(\beta) \to 0$*. Thus,* $\lambda g(\beta) \to \rho$*, and* $g(\beta) \sim \frac{\rho}{\lambda}$*. Since* $g(\beta) \sim \frac{1}{\beta}$ *as* $\beta \to \infty$*, we conclude that*

$$\beta \sim \frac{\lambda}{\rho}, \qquad \text{as } \lambda \to \infty. \tag{2.44}$$

Moreover, the optimal C^* *satisfies:*

$$C^* \sim (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{\rho}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}, \qquad \text{as } \lambda \to \infty. \tag{2.45}$$

(iv) Assume that the parameters are chosen so that

$$(\rho - \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]) - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) (\mathbb{E}[Y_1])^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \to 0. \tag{2.46}$$

Then, it follows that $g(\beta) \to \mathbb{E}[Y_1]$ *and* $\beta \to 0$*. More precisely, as* $\beta \to 0$*,* $g(\beta) \sim \mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}[Y_1^2]$ *if* $\mathbb{E}[Y_1^2] < \infty$*, and* (2.35) *becomes*

$$\rho - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) \left(\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}[Y_1^2]\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} - \lambda \left(\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}[Y_1^2]\right) = O(\beta^2). \tag{2.47}$$

as $\beta \to 0$*. Then, it follows that*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) \left(\mathbb{E}[Y_1]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} - \frac{1}{2(1-\gamma)} (\mathbb{E}[Y_1])^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}} \mathbb{E}[Y_1^2]\beta\right) \\ - \lambda \left(\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \frac{\beta}{2}\mathbb{E}[Y_1^2]\right) = O(\beta^2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\beta \sim \frac{-(\rho - \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]) + (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) (\mathbb{E}[Y_1])^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}}{(\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \frac{1}{2\gamma} (\mathbb{E}[Y_1])^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}} \mathbb{E}[Y_1^2] + \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbb{E}[Y_1^2]}. \tag{2.49}$$

Moreover, the optimal C^* *satisfies:*

$$C^* \sim (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} (\mathbb{E}[Y_1])^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}. \tag{2.50}$$

Remark 6. *The value function* $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$ *and the optimal investment rate* C^* *also depend on the parameter* γ*. We will study* $\gamma = 1$ *case in details later. For the moment, let us try to understand the asymptotic behavior of the value function and the optimal investment rate as* $\gamma \to 1^-$*. We will also obtain the asymptotics as* $\gamma \to 0^+$*. Let us recall that the optimal* C^* *satisfies the equation:*

$$\lambda + (1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma = \rho\delta\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1}. \tag{2.51}$$

Thus, we have $(1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma \leq \rho\delta\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1}$ *which implies that*

$$C^* \leq \frac{\rho\gamma}{1-\gamma}. \tag{2.52}$$

Thus, $C^* \to 0$ as $\gamma \to 0$. Note that $\lim_{\gamma \to 0^+} \gamma^\gamma = 1$. Therefore, we can check that

$$C^* \sim \frac{\rho\delta}{\lambda+\delta}\gamma, \qquad \text{as } \gamma \to 0^+. \tag{2.53}$$

Now, let us consider the $\gamma \to 1^-$ limit. Let us rewrite that equation (2.51) as

$$\frac{\lambda}{(1-\gamma)^{1-\gamma}} + \delta D^\gamma = \frac{\rho\delta\gamma}{D^{1-\gamma}}, \tag{2.54}$$

where $D = (1-\gamma)C^*$. Let us first consider the case $\rho\delta > \lambda$. Notice first that $\lim_{\gamma\to 1^-}(1-\gamma)^{1-\gamma} = 1$. First, D cannot go to 0 as $\gamma \to 1^-$, because otherwise the left hand side of (2.54) goes to λ and as D goes to 0, $D < 1$ and $D^{1-\gamma} \leq 1$, so the right hand side of (2.54) is greater than $\rho\delta\gamma$. Then, in the limit as $\gamma \to 1^-$, we get $\lambda \geq \rho\delta$, which is a contradiction. Second, D cannot go to ∞ as $\gamma \to 1^-$. To see this, notice that as $D \to \infty$, the left hand side of (2.54) goes to ∞ and in the right hand side of (2.54), for large D, $D > 1$ and $D^{1-\gamma} \geq 1$ and hence the right hand side is less than $\rho\delta$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore, if $\rho\delta > \lambda$, D converges to a positive constant, which from (2.54) we can see that the limit is $\frac{\rho\delta-\lambda}{\delta}$, and we have

$$C^* \sim \frac{\rho\delta-\lambda}{\delta}\frac{1}{1-\gamma}, \qquad \text{as } \gamma \to 1^-. \tag{2.55}$$

If $\rho\delta < \lambda$, then the optimal $C^* \to 0$ as $\gamma \to 1^-$. To see this, notice that if $\limsup_{\gamma\to 1^-} C^* \in (0,\infty)$, then in (2.51), we have $\limsup_{\gamma\to 1^-} \rho\delta\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1} = \rho\delta$ and $\limsup_{\gamma\to 1^-}[\lambda + (1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma] = \lambda$, which is a contradiction since $\rho\delta < \lambda$. If $\limsup_{\gamma\to 1^-} C^* = \infty$, then for $C^* > 1$, we have from (2.51) that $\lambda < \lambda + (1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma = \rho\delta\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1} < \rho\delta$, which is again a contraction. Hence, we must have $C^* \to 0$.

Since $C^* \to 0$, $(1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma \ll \rho\delta\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1}$, and thus

$$C^* \sim \left(\frac{\lambda}{\rho\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \sim \frac{1}{e}\left(\frac{\rho\delta}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}, \qquad \text{as } \gamma \to 1^-. \tag{2.56}$$

If $\rho\delta = \lambda$, the optimal C^* satisfies the equation:

$$\lambda = \frac{(1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma}{\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1}-1}. \tag{2.57}$$

Assume that $C^* > 0$ is fixed, then by L'Hôpital's rule,

$$\lim_{\gamma\to 1^-}\frac{(1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma}{\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1}-1} = \lim_{\gamma\to 1^-}\frac{-\delta(C^*)^\gamma + (1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma\log C^*}{(C^*)^{\gamma-1}+\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1}\log C^*} = \frac{-\delta C^*}{1+\log C^*}. \tag{2.58}$$

Therefore as $\gamma \to 1^-$, C^* converges to the unique positive solution to the equation:

$$\delta x + \lambda(1+\log x) = 0. \tag{2.59}$$

2.2. **The $\gamma = 1$ Case.** When $\gamma = 1$, this is a singular control problem and $V(x)$ satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, see e.g. Chapter 8 in [12]:

$$\begin{aligned}\min\Bigg\{ &-\rho V'(x) + \lambda\int_0^\infty [V(x+y)-V(x)]p(y)dy, \\ &-V'(x) + \delta\int_0^\infty [V(x+y)-V(x)]p(y)dy\Bigg\} = 0,\end{aligned} \tag{2.60}$$

with boundary condition $V(0) = 1$.

Intuitively, we can argue as follows. When $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]} \geq \frac{\lambda}{\rho}$, the ruin probability is 1 without any investment in research and development. When $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]} < \frac{\lambda}{\rho}$, the ruin probability is $e^{-\alpha x}$ which is less than 1, where α is the unique positive value satisfying the equation:

$$\rho\alpha + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{2.61}$$

If we invest with constant rate C and if $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]} < \frac{\lambda+\delta C}{\rho+C}$, the ruin probability is $e^{-\alpha_C x}$, where α_C is the unique positive value satisfying the equation:

$$(\rho + C)\alpha_C + (\lambda + \delta C) \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha_C y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{2.62}$$

When $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]} - \delta < 0$, it is always possible to invest to achieve a ruin probability less than 1. Otherwise, investment would not help at all.

Therefore, we have the following conclusions:

- $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]} - \delta < 0$, $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] > \rho$. In this case, the ruin probability is less than 1 without any investment in research and development. But if you invest in research and development, it will help to lower the ruin probability. The critical threshold is $\delta = \frac{\lambda}{\rho}$. If $\delta > \frac{\lambda}{\rho}$, we can see that the value function is given by $V(x) = e^{-\alpha_\infty x}$, where α_∞ is the unique positive value satisfying the equation:

$$\alpha_\infty + \delta \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha_\infty y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{2.63}$$

  That is achieved by investing $C \to +\infty$.

  If $\delta < \frac{\lambda}{\rho}$, we can see that the optimal strategy is not to invest and $V(x) = e^{-\alpha x}$.
- $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]} - \delta < 0$, $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] < \rho$. In this case, the ruin occurs with probability 1 without any investment in research and development. But if you invest aggressively in research and development, the ruin probability will fall below 1. We can see that $V(x) = e^{-\alpha_\infty x}$.

Next, we try to prove the claims above rigorously. We rely on the random time change technique, which is often used in stochastic analysis.

2.2.1. *Random Time Change.* Let us now show that the value function $V(x)$ and the optimal strategy are indeed what we described above for $\gamma = 1$ case.

For any $C \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$dX_t^C = -(\rho + C_t)dt + dJ_t^C, \tag{2.64}$$

where $J_t^C = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t^C} Y_i$, where N_t^C is a simple point process with intensity $\lambda + \delta C_{t-}$ at time t and Y_i are i.i.d. with probability density function $p(y)$ as before.

Let us introduce a random time change and define $T(t)$ via:

$$\int_0^{T(t)} (\lambda + \delta C_s)ds = t. \tag{2.65}$$

Then, it is easy to see that $T(0) = 0$ and $T(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$ since $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is bounded. Then,

$$dX_{T(t)} = -(\rho + C_{T(t)})dT(t) + dJ^C_{T(t)}. \tag{2.66}$$

Under the random time change, $\frac{dT(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{\lambda+\delta C_t}$ and $J^C_{T(t)}$ is distributed as $\overline{J}_t := \sum_{i=1}^{\overline{N}_t} Y_i$, where $\overline{N}_t$ is a standard Poisson process with intensity 1. See e.g. Meyer [21] for the random time change for simple point processes.

Therefore,

$$dX_{T(t)} = -\frac{\rho + C_{T(t)}}{\lambda + \delta C_{T(t)}}dt + d\overline{J}_t. \tag{2.67}$$

Let us also notice that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_t \text{ ever gets ruined}) = \mathbb{P}(X_{T(t)} \text{ ever gets ruined}). \tag{2.68}$$

When $\frac{\rho}{\lambda} < \frac{1}{\delta}$, then $\inf_{C\geq 0} \frac{\rho+C}{\lambda+\delta C} = \frac{\rho}{\lambda}$ and the optimal strategy is $C_t \equiv 0$. In this case, the value function $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, where

$$\rho\beta + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\beta y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{2.69}$$

When $\frac{\rho}{\lambda} > \frac{1}{\delta}$, then $\inf_{C\geq 0} \frac{\rho+C}{\lambda+\delta C} = \infty$. And for any $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\overline{C} := \|C\|_\infty$, $\overline{C}$ is more optimal than C. The "optimal strategy" is $C_t \equiv \infty$. Let us also assume that $\delta\mathbb{E}[Y_1] > 1$. In this case, the value function $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, where

$$\beta + \delta \int_0^\infty [e^{-\beta y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{2.70}$$

When $\frac{\rho}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{\delta}$, in terms of ruin probability, it does not make a difference whether the company decides to invest in research and development or not.

Remark 7. *When $\frac{\rho}{\lambda} \geq \frac{1}{\delta}$, $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, where β satisfies* (2.70) *that is independent of ρ and λ. Asymptotically, when $\frac{\rho}{\lambda} \to 0$, it is easy to see that*

$$\beta \sim \frac{\lambda}{\rho}. \tag{2.71}$$

Example 8. *In the special case that $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$, when $\frac{\rho}{\lambda} < \frac{1}{\delta}$, then the optimal $C \equiv 0$ and $V(x) = e^{-(\frac{\lambda}{\rho}-\nu)x}$, and when $\frac{\rho}{\lambda} > \frac{1}{\delta}$ and $\frac{\delta}{\nu} > 1$, then the optimal $C \equiv \infty$ and $V(x) = e^{-(\delta-\nu)x}$.*

3. A State-Dependent Dual Risk Model

Indeed, the method of random time change used in Section 2.2.1 also works for $0 < \gamma < 1$. This gives an alternative approach to solving the optimal control problem other than using the usual Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. In this section, we want to study the more general state-dependent dual risk model in which $\lambda(x), \rho(x), \delta(x)$ all depend on the wealth process. A state-dependent dual risk model was first introduced in Zhu [32]:

$$dX_t = -\rho(X_t)dt + dJ_t, \tag{3.1}$$

where $J_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} Y_i$, where Y_i are defined same as before and N_t is a simple point process with intensity $\lambda(X_{t-})$ at time t. Now, adding controls on investment on research and development, for $C \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$dX_t^C = -(\rho(X_t) + C_t)dt + dJ_t^C, \tag{3.2}$$

where $J_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} Y_i$, where Y_i are defined same as before and N_t is a simple point process with intensity $\lambda(X_{t-}) + \delta(X_{t-})C_t^\gamma$ at time t.

The motivation of introducing state-dependence for the dual risk model is the following. Firstly, the cost of a company usually increases as the size of the company increases. For example, the running cost of a small business and a Fortune 500 company are vastly different. Secondly, as the size of a company increases, the arrival intensity of the future profits might increase. It may be due to the fact that the larger a company gets, the more resources for income it will get. It is also well known in the finance literature that as a company gets larger and stronger, it can enjoy more benefits, e.g. net present value (NPV), which for example might be due to the opportunities brought by franchising. As we can see from Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3, the R&D expenditure may be far from being constant as the size of the company and the revenue of the company change. More realistically, the R&D expenditure and other costs of running the company should be state-dependent.

From the optimal control point of view, it is also interesting to study the state-dependent case. We noticed that in the state-independent case, the optimal strategy is always a constant, and independent of the state. We expect that the optimal strategy might be state-dependent when the underlying dual risk model is state-dependent.

Let us assume that $\lambda(\cdot) \geq \lambda_0 > 0$ for some $\lambda_0 \in (0, \infty)$. Under the random time change,

$$\int_0^{T(t)} (\lambda(X_s) + \delta(X_s)C_s^\gamma)ds = t, \tag{3.3}$$

we get

$$dX_{T(t)} = -\frac{\rho(X_{T(t)}) + C_{T(t)}}{\lambda(X_{T(t)}) + \delta(X_{T(t)})C_{T(t)}^\gamma}dt + d\overline{J}_t. \tag{3.4}$$

3.1. **The $0 < \gamma < 1$ Case.** Under the assumption that $0 < \gamma < 1$, it is easy to see that the optimal strategy $C_{T(t)}$ is the strategy that minimizes the drift:

$$\frac{\rho(X_{T(t)}) + C_{T(t)}}{\lambda(X_{T(t)}) + \delta(X_{T(t)})C_{T(t)}^\gamma}. \tag{3.5}$$

It is easy to compute that the optimal strategy satisfies

$$\lambda(X_{T(t)}) + \delta(X_{T(t)})(1-\gamma)C_{T(t)}^\gamma = \rho(X_{T(t)})\delta(X_{T(t)})\gamma C_{T(t)}^{\gamma-1}. \tag{3.6}$$

Therefore, for any $t > 0$, the optimal strategy C_t satisfies

$$\lambda(X_t) + \delta(X_t)(1-\gamma)C_t^\gamma = \rho(X_t)\delta(X_t)\gamma C_t^{\gamma-1}. \tag{3.7}$$

It is clear that the optimal strategy C_t is a function of X_t, say $C^*(X_t)$. Then under the optimal strategy,

$$dX_t = -(\rho(X_t) + C^*(X_t))dt + dJ_t, \tag{3.8}$$

where $J_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} Y_i$, where N_t has intensity $\lambda(X_{t-}) + \delta(X_{t-})C^*(X_{t-})^\gamma$ at time t.

When $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$ is exponential, Zhu [32] computed $\mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty)$ in closed-form by differentiating w.r.t. x and turning the integral differential equation into an ordinary differential equation. Here, we omit the derivations and we directly refer the results in Zhu [32] instead.

We have the following result:

Proposition 9. *Assume $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$, where $\nu > 0$. Also assume that the integral $\int_0^\infty \frac{\lambda(y)+\delta(y)C^*(y)^\gamma}{\rho(y)+C^*(y)} e^{\nu y - \int_0^y \frac{\lambda(w)+\delta(w)C^*(w)^\gamma}{\rho(w)+C^*(w)}dw} dy$ exists and is finite. Then,*

$$V(x) = \frac{\int_x^\infty \frac{\lambda(y)+\delta(y)C^*(y)^\gamma}{\rho(y)+C^*(y)} e^{\nu y - \int_0^y \frac{\lambda(w)+\delta(w)C^*(w)^\gamma}{\rho(w)+C^*(w)}dw} dy}{\int_0^\infty \frac{\lambda(y)+\delta(y)C^*(y)^\gamma}{\rho(y)+C^*(y)} e^{\nu y - \int_0^y \frac{\lambda(w)+\delta(w)C^*(w)^\gamma}{\rho(w)+C^*(w)}dw} dy}. \tag{3.9}$$

In Zhu [32], many examples are given for the state-dependent risk model where the ruin probability without investment has explicit formulas. Let us use an example from [32] to illustrate that in the presence of investment in research and development, it is still possible to get closed-form formulas.

Example 10. *Let $\rho(x) = \rho_0$, $\lambda(x) = \lambda_0(c_1 x + c_2)$, and $\delta(x) = \delta_0(c_1 x + c_2)$, where $\rho_0, \lambda_0, \delta_0, c_1, c_2$ are positive constants. Then, the optimal investment rate $C^*(x)$ is a constant $C^*(x) \equiv C_0$, where C_0 is the unique positive solution to the equation:*

$$\lambda_0 + \delta_0(1-\gamma)C_0^\gamma = \rho_0 \delta_0 \gamma C_0^{\gamma-1}. \tag{3.10}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &= \frac{\int_x^\infty \frac{\lambda_0+\delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0+C_0}(c_1 y + c_2) e^{\nu y - \int_0^y \frac{\lambda_0+\delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0+C_0}(c_1 w + c_2)dw} dy}{\int_0^\infty \frac{\lambda_0+\delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0+C_0}(c_1 y + c_2) e^{\nu y - \int_0^y \frac{\lambda_0+\delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0+C_0}(c_1 w + c_2)dw} dy} \\ &= \frac{\int_x^\infty (c_1 y + c_2) e^{\left(\nu - \frac{\lambda_0+\delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0+C_0} c_2\right) y - \frac{\lambda_0+\delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0+C_0}\frac{c_1}{2} y^2} dy}{\int_0^\infty (c_1 y + c_2) e^{\left(\nu - \frac{\lambda_0+\delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0+C_0} c_2\right) y - \frac{\lambda_0+\delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0+C_0}\frac{c_1}{2} y^2} dy} \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{4d^{3/2}} e^{-dy^2} \left[\sqrt{\pi} e^{\frac{c^2}{4d}+dy^2}(ac+2bd) erf(\frac{2dy-c}{2\sqrt{d}}) - 2a\sqrt{d} e^{cy}\right]\Big|_{y=x}^{\infty}}{\frac{1}{4d^{3/2}} e^{-dy^2} \left[\sqrt{\pi} e^{\frac{c^2}{4d}+dy^2}(ac+2bd) erf(\frac{2dy-c}{2\sqrt{d}}) - 2a\sqrt{d} e^{cy}\right]\Big|_{y=0}^{\infty}} \\ &= \frac{2a\sqrt{d} e^{cx-dx^2} + \sqrt{\pi} e^{\frac{c^2}{4d}}(ac+2bd) erfc(\frac{2dx-c}{2\sqrt{d}})}{2a\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\pi} e^{\frac{c^2}{4d}}(ac+2bd) erfc(\frac{-c}{2\sqrt{d}})}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where $erf(x) := \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt$ is the error function and $erfc(x) := 1 - erf(x)$ is the complementary error function and $a := c_1$, $b := c_2$, and

$$c := \nu - \frac{\lambda_0 + \delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0 + C_0} c_2, \qquad d := \frac{\lambda_0 + \delta_0 C_0^\gamma}{\rho_0 + C_0} \frac{c_1}{2}. \tag{3.12}$$

3.2. **The $\gamma = 1$ Case.** When $\gamma = 1$, by using the random time change argument, the optimal $C^*(x)$ satisfies $C^*(x) = 0$ in the region where $\delta(x) \leq \frac{\lambda(x)}{\rho(x)}$ and the "optimal" $C^*(x) = \infty$ in the region where $\delta(x) > \frac{\lambda(x)}{\rho(x)}$.

Remark 11. *If we impose a research and development budget constraint by $M \in (0,\infty)$, the maximum capacity. Then, the admissible set of controls is given by $\mathcal{C}_M := \{C \in \mathcal{C} : \sup_{t\geq 0} C_t \leq M\}$. Then the above analysis implies that $C^*(x) = 0$ in the region $\delta(x) \leq \frac{\lambda(x)}{\rho(x)}$ and $C^*(x) = M$ in the region $\delta(x) > \frac{\lambda(x)}{\rho(x)}$.*

Zhu [32] found many examples for the state-dependent dual risk model that has closed-form expressions for the ruin probability without any investment in research and development. Let us consider a simple example from [32] as an illustration that keeps the analytical tractability even with the investment in research and development.

Example 12. *Let $\rho(x) = \rho_0(c_1 x + c_2)$, $\lambda(x) = \left(\nu + \frac{\lambda_0}{1+x}\right)\rho(x)$, and $\delta(x) = \delta_0$, where $\rho_0, c_1, c_2, \lambda_0, \delta_0$ are positive constants. We further assume that*

$$\nu < \delta_0 < \nu + \lambda_0. \tag{3.13}$$

Then, the optimal C^* is given by:

$$C^*(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq \frac{\lambda_0 - \delta_0 + \nu}{\delta_0 - \nu}, \\ +\infty & \text{if } x > \frac{\lambda_0 - \delta_0 + \nu}{\delta_0 - \nu}. \end{cases} \tag{3.14}$$

Let us define:

$$x^* := \frac{\lambda_0 - \delta_0 + \nu}{\delta_0 - \nu}. \tag{3.15}$$

Then, we can compute that for any $y \leq x^*$,

$$\int_0^y \frac{\lambda(w) + \delta(w)C^*(w)}{\rho(w) + C^*(w)} dw = \int_0^y \left(\nu + \frac{\lambda_0}{1+w}\right) dw = \nu y + \lambda_0 \log(1+y), \tag{3.16}$$

and for any $y > x^*$,

$$\int_0^y \frac{\lambda(w) + \delta(w)C^*(w)}{\rho(w) + C^*(w)} dw = \nu x^* + \lambda_0 \log(1+x^*) + \delta_0(y - x^*). \tag{3.17}$$

Therefore, for $x > x^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_x^\infty \frac{\lambda(y) + \delta(y)C^*(y)}{\rho(y) + C^*(y)} e^{\nu y - \int_0^y \frac{\lambda(w)+\delta(w)C^*(w)}{\rho(w)+C^*(w)} dw} dy \\ &= \int_x^\infty \delta_0 e^{\nu y - \nu x^* - \lambda_0 \log(1+x^*) - \delta_0(y - x^*)} dy \\ &= \frac{e^{-\nu x^* + \delta_0 x^*}}{(1+x^*)^{\lambda_0}} \frac{\delta_0}{\delta_0 - \nu} e^{-(\delta_0 - \nu)x}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

and for $x \leq x^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_x^\infty \frac{\lambda(y) + \delta(y)C^*(y)}{\rho(y) + C^*(y)} e^{\nu y - \int_0^y \frac{\lambda(w)+\delta(w)C^*(w)}{\rho(w)+C^*(w)} dw} dy \\ &= \int_x^{x^*} \left(\nu + \frac{\lambda_0}{1+y}\right) e^{\nu y - \nu y - \lambda_0 \log(1+y)} dy + \frac{1}{(1+x^*)^{\lambda_0}} \frac{\delta_0}{\delta_0 - \nu} \\ &= \frac{\nu}{1-\lambda_0} \left[(1+x^*)^{-\lambda_0+1} - (1+x)^{-\lambda_0+1}\right] + (1+x)^{-\lambda_0} - (1+x^*)^{-\lambda_0} + \frac{1}{(1+x^*)^{\lambda_0}} \frac{\delta_0}{\delta_0 - \nu}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Hence, we conclude that for $x > x^*$, we have

$$V(x) = \frac{\frac{e^{-\nu x^* + \delta_0 x^*}}{(1+x^*)^{\lambda_0}} \frac{\delta_0}{\delta_0 - \nu} e^{-(\delta_0 - \nu)x}}{\frac{\nu}{1-\lambda_0}\left[(1+x^*)^{-\lambda_0+1} - 1\right] + 1 - (1+x^*)^{-\lambda_0} + \frac{1}{(1+x^*)^{\lambda_0}} \frac{\delta_0}{\delta_0 - \nu}}, \tag{3.20}$$

and for $x \leq x^*$, we have

$$V(x) = \frac{\frac{\nu}{1-\lambda_0}\left[(1+x^*)^{-\lambda_0+1} - (1+x)^{-\lambda_0+1}\right] + (1+x)^{-\lambda_0} - (1+x^*)^{-\lambda_0} + \frac{1}{(1+x^*)^{\lambda_0}} \frac{\delta_0}{\delta_0 - \nu}}{\frac{\nu}{1-\lambda_0}\left[(1+x^*)^{-\lambda_0+1} - 1\right] + 1 - (1+x^*)^{-\lambda_0} + \frac{1}{(1+x^*)^{\lambda_0}} \frac{\delta_0}{\delta_0 - \nu}}. \tag{3.21}$$

4. Investing in a Market Index

We have already studied the optimal investment in research and development for a venture capital or high tech company in the dual risk model, and now, let us also add the possibility of the alternative investment in a risky asset in the market, which is a capital market index modelled by a geometric Brownian motion.

Let us assume that the market index S_t follows a geometric Brownian motion:

$$dS_t = \mu S_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mu, \sigma > 0$ and W_t is a standard Brownian motion.

Assume that at time t, the company can invest θ_t shares of the market index S_t and C_t in research and development. Thus, the wealth process of the company satisfies the dynamics:

$$dX_t = -(\rho + C_t)dt + dJ_t^C + \theta_t dS_t, \qquad X_0 = x > 0 \tag{4.2}$$

The invested amount in the market index is $A_t = \theta_t S_t$ at time t.

We are interested to find optimal investment strategies to minimize the probability of ruin:

$$V(x) := \inf_{C \in \mathcal{C}, A \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty | X_0 = x), \tag{4.3}$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is the same as defined before and $\mathcal{A}$ is the admissible strategies for investment in the market index, defined as:

$$\mathcal{A} := \Bigg\{ A : [0,\infty) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R} : A \text{ is progressively measurable and for any } t > 0, \text{ there exists } K > 0 \text{ such that } \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t A_s^2 ds < \infty\right) = 1. \Bigg\}. \tag{4.4}$$

The Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation is given by

$$\inf_{C \geq 0, A \in \mathbb{R}} \Bigg\{ -(\rho + C)V'(x) + (\lambda + \delta C^\gamma) \int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)] p(y) dy + A\mu V'(x) + \frac{1}{2} A^2 \sigma^2 V''(x) \Bigg\} = 0, \tag{4.5}$$

with boundary condition $V(0) = 1$.

4.1. **The $0 < \gamma < 1$ Case.**

Lemma 13. *$V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$ is a solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation (4.5), where $\beta > 0$ is the unique solution to the equation:*

(4.6)
$$\beta\left[\rho + \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\right] - \left[\lambda + \delta\left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\right]\left(1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy\right) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2} = 0.$$

Given $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$ and let

(4.7)
$$(C^*, A^*) \in \operatorname{argmin}\Big\{ -(\rho + C)V'(x) + (\lambda + \delta C^\gamma)\int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)]p(y)dy + A\mu V'(x) + \frac{1}{2}A^2\sigma^2 V''(x)\Big\}.$$

Then, we have

$$C^* = \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$A^* = \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2\beta}. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. Assume that $V'(x) < 0$ and $V''(x) > 0$, then, the optimal C and A are given respectively by

$$C = \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{V'(x)}{\int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)]p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \tag{4.10}$$

$$A = -\frac{\mu V'(x)}{\sigma^2 V''(x)}, \tag{4.11}$$

and the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation becomes

$$-\left[\rho + \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{V'(x)}{\int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)]p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\right]V'(x) + \left[\lambda + \delta\left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{V'(x)}{\int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)]p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\right] \cdot \int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)]p(y)dy - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{(V'(x))^2}{V''(x)} = 0. \tag{4.12}$$

We can see that $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, where $\beta > 0$ is the unique solution to the equation:

(4.13)
$$\beta\left[\rho + \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\right] - \left[\lambda + \delta\left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\right]\left(1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy\right) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2} = 0.$$

Recall the definition $g(\beta) = \frac{1}{\beta}\left[1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy\right]$ and we want to show that the equation

$$H(\beta) := \rho - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma-1}\right)[g(\beta)]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} - \lambda g(\beta) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{1}{\beta} = 0 \tag{4.14}$$

has a unique positive solution. It is easy to see that $\lim_{\beta\to 0^+} g(\beta) = \mathbb{E}[Y_1]$ and $\lim_{\beta\to\infty} g(\beta) = 0$. Thus, $H(\beta) \sim -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2\beta} < 0$ as $\beta \to 0^+$ and $H(\beta) \to \rho$ as $\beta \to \infty$. We have already proved that $g(\beta)$ is decreasing in β. Moreover, $\frac{1}{\beta}$ is also decreasing in β. Therefore $H(\beta)$ is increasing in β and hence there exists a unique positive value β so that $H(\beta) = 0$.

Finally, we can compute that

$$C^* = \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{\beta}{1-\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y}p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \qquad A^* = \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2\beta}. \tag{4.15}$$

□

4.1.1. *A Verification Theorem.* Let us recall that the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation is given by

(4.16)
$$0 = \inf_{C>0, A\in\mathbb{R}}\Big\{-(\rho+C)V'(x) + (\lambda+\delta C^\gamma)\int_0^\infty [V(x+y)-V(x)]p(y)dy + A\mu V'(x) + \frac{1}{2}A^2\sigma^2V''(x)\Big\},$$

with boundary condition $V(0) = 1$.

Theorem 14 (Vertification)**.** *If $w \in \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{b}}^2$ is a solution of (4.16) with $w(0) = 1$, such that for any $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} w(X_t^{C,A})1_{\{t\le\tau\}} = 0 \ \text{ a.s.}, \tag{4.17}$$

then, $w \le V$. In addition, if

$$C^*(x) := \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{w'(x)}{\int_0^\infty [w(x+y)-w(x)]p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \ \text{ and } \ A^*(x) = -\frac{\mu w'(x)}{\sigma^2 w''(x)},$$

are such that

$$dX_t^* = -(\rho + C^*(X_t^*))dt + dJ_t^{C^*(X_{t-}^*)} + A^*(X_t^*)dS_t$$

has a solution and $C^*_\cdot := C^*(X^*_\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}$ *and* $A^*_\cdot := A^*(X^*_\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$*, then* $w = V$*.*

Proof. The inequality follows from the same lines of argument as in Theorem 3. To show the equality, first notice that since

$$(C^*, A^*) \in \underset{C,A}{\operatorname{argmin}} \Big\{ -(\rho + C)w'(x) + (\lambda + \delta C^\gamma) \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)]p(y)dy + A\mu w'(x) + \frac{1}{2}A^2\sigma^2 w''(x) \Big\},$$

one can repeat the proof of the second part of Theorem 3 to show $w = V$. □

Corollary 15. $w(x) = e^{-\beta x}$ *with* β *defined in* (4.6) *satisfies* (4.17) *and thus* $w = V$*.*

Proof. We already showed that w is a classical solution of the boundary value problem (4.16). The fact that w satisfies (5.8) follows from the same lines of argument as in Theorem 3. Moreover, since C^* and A^* defined by

$$C^* = \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(-\frac{\beta}{\int_0^\infty [e^{-\beta x} - 1]p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad A^* = \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2\beta},$$

are admissible controls (constants), by Theorem 14 we have $w = V$. □

4.1.2. *Asymptotic Analysis.*

Remark 16. *As in Remark 5, let us discuss the dependence of* C^**,* β *and hence* $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$ *on the parameters* ρ*,* λ *and* δ*. Since the results are similar to Remark 5, we omit the details and only summarize the results here. Note that* β *satisfies*

$$\rho - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) [g(\beta)]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} - \lambda g(\beta) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{1}{\beta} = 0. \tag{4.18}$$

(i) As $\rho \to 0^+$*, we have*

$$\beta \sim \frac{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}}{\rho}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad C^* \sim (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{\rho}{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}. \tag{4.19}$$

(ii) As $\delta \to \infty$*, we have*

$$\beta \sim \frac{\gamma\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right)^{1-\gamma}}{\rho^{1-\gamma}}\delta, \qquad \text{and} \qquad C^* \to \frac{\rho}{\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1}. \tag{4.20}$$

As $\delta \to 0$*, we have* $\beta \to \alpha$*, where* α *is the unique positive value so that*

$$\rho\alpha + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha y} - 1]p(y)dy - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2} = 0. \tag{4.21}$$

Moreover, as $\delta \to 0$*, we have*

$$C^* \sim (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{\rho - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}. \tag{4.22}$$

(iii) As $\lambda \to \infty$*, we have*

$$\beta \sim \frac{\lambda}{\rho}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad C^* \sim (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left(\frac{\rho}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}. \tag{4.23}$$

Remark 17. *Let us try understand the asymptotic behavior of the value function and the optimal investment rate as $\gamma \to 1^-$ and $\gamma \to 0^+$. Note that the optimal C^* and β satisfy:*

$$\rho - \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) C^* - \frac{\lambda}{\delta\gamma}(C^*)^{1-\gamma} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{1}{\beta} = 0, \tag{4.24}$$

and

$$C^* = \left(\frac{1}{\delta\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta y} p(y)dy}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}. \tag{4.25}$$

(i) As $\gamma \to 0^+$, $C^* \sim \eta\gamma$ for some $\eta > 0$ and $\beta \to \iota$ for some $\iota > 0$. It is easy to check that $\eta, \iota > 0$ satisfy:

$$\eta = \frac{1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\iota y} p(y)dy}{\iota}, \tag{4.26}$$

and $\rho - \eta - \frac{\lambda}{\delta}\eta - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{1}{\iota} = 0$, thus

$$\rho - \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{\delta}\right)\frac{1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\iota y} p(y)dy}{\iota} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{1}{\iota} = 0. \tag{4.27}$$

(ii) Next, let us consider $\gamma \to 1^-$.

If $\delta\mathbb{E}[Y_1] > 1$, then there exists a unique value $\iota > 0$ such that

$$\delta = \frac{\iota}{1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\iota y} p(y)dy}. \tag{4.28}$$

Assume further that

$$\rho - \frac{\lambda}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2\iota} > 0. \tag{4.29}$$

Then, we have $C^* \sim \frac{\eta}{1-\gamma}$ and $\beta \to \iota$ as $\gamma \to 1^-$, where η is given by

$$\eta = \rho - \frac{\lambda}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2\iota}. \tag{4.30}$$

If $\rho - \frac{\lambda}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2\iota} < 0$, the optimal $C^* \to 0$ as $\gamma \to 1^-$ and $C^* \sim \left(\frac{\rho - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{1}{\beta}}{\frac{\lambda}{\delta\gamma}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}$ and $\beta \to \iota$ as $\gamma \to 1^-$. We can check that η, ι satify the equations:

$$\eta = \frac{\lambda}{\delta\left(\rho - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2\iota}\right)}, \tag{4.31}$$

$$\delta = \frac{\iota}{1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\iota y} p(y)dy}. \tag{4.32}$$

As $\gamma \to 1^-$, we have

$$C^* \sim \frac{1}{e}\left(\frac{\delta\left(\rho - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2\iota}\right)}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}. \tag{4.33}$$

If $\rho - \frac{\lambda}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2\iota} = 0$, then, as $\gamma \to 1^-$, we have that C^* converges to the unique positive solution to the equation:

$$\delta x + \lambda(1 + \log x) = 0. \tag{4.34}$$

4.2. **The $\gamma = 1$ Case.** Consider the case where $\gamma = 1$, i.e. for $x > 0$. Then this is a singular control problem on $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and the value function $V(x)$ satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \min \Bigg\{ & -\rho V'(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)] p(y) dy \\ & + \inf_{A \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ A\mu V'(x) + \frac{1}{2} A^2 \sigma^2 V''(x) \right\}, \\ & \qquad \delta \int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)] p(y) dy - V'(x) \Bigg\} \end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

with boundary condition $V(0) = 1$. Optimizing over A, it reduces to the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \min \Bigg\{ & -\rho V'(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)] p(y) dy - \frac{\mu^2 (V')^2}{2\sigma^2 V''}, \\ & \qquad \delta \int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)] p(y) dy - V'(x) \Bigg\} \end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

with boundary condition $V(0) = 1$.

For $w \in \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{b}}^2$, we define

$$\mathcal{P} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_+ \ : \ \delta \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)] p(y) dy - w'(x) > 0 \right\}.$$

According to Fleming–Soner [12, Chapter 8], w is a classical solution of (4.36) if

(i) On $\mathcal{P}$, w satisfies

$$0 = -\rho w'(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)] p(y) dy - \frac{\mu^2 (w')^2}{2\sigma^2 w''}$$

(ii) On $\mathbb{R}_+$, w satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & 0 \le -\rho w'(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)] p(y) dy - \frac{\mu^2 (w')^2}{2\sigma^2 w''} \\ & 0 \le \delta \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)] p(y) dy - w'(x) \end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

(iii) $w(0) = 1$.

Lemma 18. *$w(x) = e^{-(\beta_1 \vee \beta_2)x}$ is a classical solution of (4.36) where β_1 is the unique positive solutions of $F(\beta) = 0$ and β_2 is the unique positive solution of $G(\beta) = 0$ if it exists or zero otherwise. Here F and G are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} F(\beta) &:= \rho\beta + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\beta y} - 1] p(y) dy - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2} \\ G(\beta) &:= \beta + \delta \int_0^\infty [e^{-\beta y} - 1] p(y) dy \end{aligned}$$

Proof. If $G'(0) = 1 - \delta\mathbb{E}[Y_1] \geq 0$, then $\beta_2 = 0$ and $G(\beta_1) > 0$. This implies that $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}_+$. By straightforward calculations,

$$-\rho w'(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)]p(y)dy - \frac{\mu^2(w')^2}{2\sigma^2 w''} = wF(\beta_1) = 0$$
$$\delta \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)]p(y)dy - w'(x) = wG(\beta_1) > 0$$

If $G'(0) = 1 - \delta\mathbb{E}[Y_1] < 0$ and $\beta_1 > \beta_2$, then $G(\beta_1) > 0$ and we have $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Similar to the previous paragraph we obtain that w is a classical solution. If $G'(0) = 1 - \delta\mathbb{E}[Y_1] < 0$ and $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2$, then $F(\beta_2) \geq 0$ and we have $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$. Thus,

$$-\rho w'(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)]p(y)dy - \frac{\mu^2(w')^2}{2\sigma^2 w''} = wF(\beta_2) \geq 0$$
$$\delta \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)]p(y)dy - w'(x) = wG(\beta_2) = 0.$$

□

4.2.1. *A Verification Theorem.*

Theorem 19 (Verification)**.** *Let $w \in \mathrm{C}_\mathrm{b}^2$ be a decreasing classical solution of problem* (4.36) *such that condition* (4.17) *holds. Then, $w(x) \leq V(x)$, where $V(x)$ is the value function of the ruin probability minimization problem with investment.*
In addition, if $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}_+$, then $w(x) = V(x)$.

Proof. Let $A = \{A_s\}_{s\geq 0}$ be an admissible strategy and $C := \{C_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ be a non-decreasing singular function, i.e. $C_t := \int_0^t dc_s$ where c_s is a non-negative measure. Then,

$$X_t^{C,A} = x - \rho t - C_t + J_t^C + \int_0^t A_s dS_s$$

where $J_t^C = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t^C} Y_i$ where N_t^C is a simple point process with compensator $\lambda t + \delta C_t$. Then, by Itô formula for C_b^2 functions, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[w(X_{t\wedge\tau}^{C,A})] = w(x) + \mathbb{E}\Bigg[&\int_0^{t\wedge\tau} \Big(- \rho w' + \lambda \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)]p(y)dy \\ &+ A_s\mu w' + \frac{1}{2}A_s^2\sigma^2 w''\Big)(X_s^{C,A})ds \\ &+ \int_0^{t\wedge\tau} \Big(- w' + \delta \int_0^\infty [w(x+y) - w(x)]p(y)dy\Big)(X_s^{C,A})dC_s^0 \\ &+ \sum_{s\leq t\wedge\tau} \big(w(X_s^{C,A} - \Delta C_s) - w(X_s^{C,A})\big)\Bigg].\end{aligned}$$

Here $C_s = C_s^0 + \Delta C_s$ where C_s^0 is the continuous part of C and ΔC_s is the pure jump part of C_s. Notice that by the definition of classical solution, (4.37) holds and therefore, the first two terms inside the expectation above are non-negative. In addition since w is non-increasing, we have $w(X_s^{C,A} - \Delta C_s) - w(X_s^{C,A}) \geq 0$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}[w(X_{t\wedge\tau}^{C,A})] \geq w(x)$. Similar to Theorem 3, by sending $t \to \infty$, (4.17) implies that $w(x) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty)$. By taking the infimum over (C, A), we obtain $w \leq V$.

Now assume that $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}_+$ and set $C \equiv 0$. It follows from the definition of A^* and Itô formula that

$$\mathbb{E}[w(X^*_{t\wedge\tau})] = w(x) + \mathbb{E}\bigg[\int_0^{t\wedge\tau}\bigg(-\rho w' + \lambda\int_0^\infty [w(x+y)-w(x)]p(y)dy + A^*\mu w' + \frac{1}{2}(A^*)^2\sigma^2 w''\bigg)(X^*_s)ds\bigg] = w(x),$$

In the above, X^* satisfies $X^*_t = x - \rho t + J^\lambda_t + \int_0^t A^*(X^*_s)dW_s$. If we let $t \to \infty$, we obtain $w(x) = \mathbb{P}(\tau^* < \infty) \geq V(x)$ where τ^* is the ruin time for process X^*. □

Corollary 20. *The classical solution $w(x) = e^{-(\beta_1\vee\beta_2)x}$ of boundary value problem* (4.16) *satisfies the assumption of the verification and thus $w = V$.*

Proof. By the same line of arguments as in Theorem 3, one can show that condition (4.17) holds true. Therefore, if $\beta_1 > \beta_2$, then $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}_+$ and $w = V$ is followed by Theorem 19. It remains to show the result for the case that when $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2$, i.e. $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$. For $c > 0$ let $w_c(x) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_c < \infty)$ with $X_t = x - (\rho + c)t + J^c_t + \int_0^t A^* dW_s$ with $A^* = \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2\beta_2}$. Then, immediately we obtain $w_c \geq V$. We want to show that $w_c(x) \to w(x) = e^{-\beta_2 x}$ as $c \to \infty$. Notice that w_c satisfies the equation

$$0 = -(\rho + c)w_c'(x) + (\lambda + \delta c)\int_0^\infty [w_c(x+y) - w_c(x)]p(y)dy - \frac{\mu^2(w_c')^2}{2\sigma^2 w_c''},$$

with the boundary condition $w_c(0) = 1$. The unique bounded solution of the above equation is given by $w_c(x) = e^{-\beta(c)x}$ where $\beta(c)$ satisfies

$$-(\rho + c)\beta(c) + (\lambda + \delta c)\int_0^\infty [e^{-\beta(c)y} - 1]p(y)dy - \frac{\mu^2}{2\sigma^2} = 0. \tag{4.38}$$

Notice that for any $c > 0$, $\beta(c)$ is uniquely determined and is continuous on c. In addition, straightforward calculations shows that $\beta(c)$ is increasing, i.e.

$$\beta'(c) = \frac{1}{c}\frac{\rho + \lambda\int_0^\infty [1 - e^{-\beta(c)y}]p(y)dy + \frac{\mu^2}{2\sigma^2}}{\rho + c + (\lambda + \delta c)\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta(c)y}yp(y)dy} > 0.$$

Thus, $\bar\beta := \lim_{c\to\infty}\beta(c)$ exists and $\bar\beta > 0$ and after dividing (4.38) by c and taking limit when $c \to \infty$, we obtain

$$G(\bar\beta) = -\bar\beta + \lambda\int_0^\infty [e^{-\bar\beta y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0.$$

Since G has a unique positive solution, we must have $\bar\beta = \beta_2$ and therefore, we obtain $V(x) \leq \lim_{c\to\infty} w_c(x) = e^{-\beta_2 x}$. □

5. Numerical Studies

In this section, we carry out numerical studies to illustrate and understand better how the minimized ruin probability and the optimal investment rate depend on the parameters in the dual risk model.

In Figure 1, we assume that Y_i are exponentially distributed so that $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$ for some $\nu > 0$. We also assume that $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] = \frac{\lambda}{\nu} > \rho$ so that the ruin probability is

less than 1 without any investment in research and development. Indeed, the ruin probability is given by $e^{-\alpha x}$, where

$$\rho\alpha + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha y} - 1]\nu e^{-\nu y} dy = \rho\alpha - \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\nu + \alpha} = 0, \tag{5.1}$$

which implies that $\alpha = \frac{\lambda}{\rho} - \nu$.

For simplicity, we assume that $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ so that as in Example 2, the minimized ruin probability is $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, where

$$\beta = \frac{\lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 + \rho\delta^2}}{2\rho} - \nu, \tag{5.2}$$

and by investing in research and development, it reduces the ruin probability. Now, if additional investment in a risky asset, e.g. a market index is allowed, then the ruin probability can be further reduced and the minimized ruin probability becomes $V(x) = e^{-\beta x}$, where by letting $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$ and $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ in (4.6), we deduce that $\beta > 0$ is the unique solution to the equation:

$$\beta\rho - \frac{\beta\delta^2}{4} \frac{1}{(\nu + \beta)^2} - \frac{\lambda\beta}{\nu + \beta} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2} = 0. \tag{5.3}$$



FIGURE 1. Illustration of the ruin probability without any investment (blue curve with circle markers), the minimized ruin probability with investment in research and development (black curve with triangle markers), and the minimized ruin probability when investment in both research and development and a market index are allowed (red dashed curve). The x-axis denotes the initial wealth of the underlying company and the y-axis denotes the (minimized) ruin probability. Here, we take $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$, $\rho = 0.1$, $\nu = 0.1$, $\lambda = 0.1$, $\delta = 1$, $\mu = 0.1$ and $\sigma = 0.2$.

In Figure 2, we investigate the dependence of the optimal C^* on the parameters γ and δ given $\rho = 2$, $\nu = 2$, and $\lambda = 0.1$. Let us recall that when investment in

research and development is allowed, the optimal investment rate C^* is the unique positive solution to the following equation:

$$\lambda + (1-\gamma)\delta(C^*)^\gamma = \rho\delta\gamma(C^*)^{\gamma-1}. \tag{5.4}$$

When additional investment in a market index is allowed, the optimal investment rate C^* for the investment in research and development remains the same. Notice that from (5.4), the optimal C^* is independent of the distribution of Y_i. And therefore the definition of C^* is independent of the condition (2.8) under which the minimized ruin probability is less than 1. Intuitively, that is because, C^* optimizes over the drift term by the random time change technique, but when the condition (2.8) is violated, even the optimal C^* still gives the ruin probability equal to 1. In Figure 2, we give the heat map plot of the optimal C^* as function of γ and δ. Note that the condition (2.8) is equivalent to

$$\rho - \frac{\lambda}{\nu} - (\delta\gamma)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}-1\right)\frac{1}{\nu^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}} < 0, \tag{5.5}$$

for $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$. When this condition is violated, then it corresponds to the darker region in the bottom half of the plot in Figure 2. The boundary is achieved when the left hand side of (5.5) is zero. In this region, the ruin probability is always 1 regardless of the investment in research and development. When the condition (5.5) is satisfied, it corresponds to the upper half of the plot in Figure 2. In this region, it is easy to observe that as δ increases, C^* increases. For the plot in Figure 2, the optimal C^* is less sensitive to the change of the parameter γ.



FIGURE 2. This is the heat map plot of C^* as a function of γ and δ. In the darker region in the bottom half of the plot, this is where ruin probability is always 1 regardless of the investment. In the upper half of the plot, the minimized ruin probability is less than 1 and it shows the heat map. Here, we take $\rho = 2$, $\nu = 2$, and $\lambda = 0.1$.

In Figure 3, we investigate the dependence of the optimal C^* on the parameters ρ and λ given $\delta = 1$, $\nu = 0.1$ and $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$. For $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$, we showed in Example 2 that

the optimal C^* is given by

$$C^* = \frac{\delta^2\rho^2}{(\lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 + \rho\delta^2})^2}. \tag{5.6}$$

When $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$ and $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$, the condition (2.8) reduces to

$$\rho - \frac{\lambda}{\nu} - \frac{\delta^2}{4\nu^2} < 0. \tag{5.7}$$

When this condition is violated, the ruin probability is always 1 regardless of the investment and it corresponds to the dark region in the right bottom corner of the plot in Figure 3. When this condition is satisfied, the heat map plot of the optimal C^* as a function of ρ and λ is illustrated in Figure 3. We can see that as ρ increases, the optimal C^* increases, and as λ increases, the optimal C^* decreases.



FIGURE 3. This is the heat map plot of C^* as a function of ρ and λ. In the darker region in the right bottom corner of the plot, this is where ruin probability is always 1 regardless of the investment. In the rest of the plot, the minimized ruin probability is less than 1 and it shows the heat map. Here, we take $\nu = 0.1$, $\gamma = 0.5$ and $\delta = 1$.

Finally, let us do some numerical studies for the state-dependent dual risk model.

First, let us consider an example for $0 < \gamma < 1$. Let us consider the model in Example 10. For simplicity, let us assume that $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$. Recall that in Example 10, $\rho(x) = \rho_0$, $\lambda(x) = \lambda_0(c_1x + c_2)$, and $\delta(x) = \delta_0(c_1x + c_2)$. The optimal investment rate $C^*(x) \equiv C_0$ is a constant and is given by:

$$C_0 = \frac{\delta_0^2\rho_0^2}{(\lambda_0 + \sqrt{\lambda_0^2 + \rho_0\delta_0^2})^2}. \tag{5.8}$$

The minimized ruin probability is given by

$$\frac{2a\sqrt{d}e^{cx-dx^2} + \sqrt{\pi}e^{\frac{c^2}{4d}}(ac + 2bd)\mathrm{erfc}(\frac{2dx-c}{2\sqrt{d}})}{2a\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\pi}e^{\frac{c^2}{4d}}(ac + 2bd)\mathrm{erfc}(\frac{-c}{2\sqrt{d}})}, \tag{5.9}$$

where x is the initial wealth, $a := c_1$, $b := c_2$, and

$$c := \nu - \frac{\lambda_0 + \delta_0 C_0^{1/2}}{\rho_0 + C_0} c_2, \qquad d := \frac{\lambda_0 + \delta_0 C_0^{1/2}}{\rho_0 + C_0} \frac{c_1}{2}. \tag{5.10}$$

By setting $C_0 = 0$ in (5.9), we get the ruin probability without any investment in research and development.

In Figure 4, the blue curve with circle markers stands for the ruin probability without investment and the red dashed curve stands for the minimized ruin probability with investment. These two curves differ from exponential decays, which is due to the flexibility of the state-dependent model. As observed in [32], for state-dependent dual risk model, the ruin probability can have subexponential, exponential and superexpontial decays in terms of the initial wealth. Also for the state-dependent dual risk model, the ruin probability may not be convex in the initial wealth (as we can see from the blue curve with circle markers in Figure 4).



FIGURE 4. Illustration of the ruin probability without any investment (blue curve with circle markers), the minimized ruin probability with investment in research and development (red dashed curve). The x-axis denotes the initial wealth of the underlying company and the y-axis denotes the (minimized) ruin probability. Here, we take $\gamma = 0.5$, $\rho_0 = 1$, $\nu = 0.1$, $\lambda_0 = 0.1$, $\delta = 1$, $c_1 = 1$, and $c_2 = 1$.

Next, let us consider an example for $\gamma = 1$ for the state-dependent dual risk model. Let us recall that in Example 12, $\rho(x) = \rho_0(c_1 x + c_2)$, $\lambda(x) = \left(\nu + \frac{\lambda_0}{1+x}\right)\rho(x)$, and $\delta(x) = \delta_0$, and under the assumption that $\nu < \delta_0 < \nu + \lambda_0$, the optimal C^* is given by $C^* = 0$ if $x \le x^*$ and $C^* = \infty$ if $x > x^*$, where

$$x^* := \frac{\lambda_0 - \delta_0 + \nu}{\delta_0 - \nu}. \tag{5.11}$$

From Example 12, with optimal investment, the minimized ruin probability is given by $V(x)$ in (3.20) if $x > x^*$ and the minimized ruin probability is given by $V(x)$ in (3.21) if $x \le x^*$, where x is the initial wealth. Without any investment, as in

[32], under the assumption that $\lambda_0 > 1$, we can compute that the ruin probability is given by

$$V(x) = \frac{\int_x^\infty \frac{\lambda(y)}{\rho(y)} e^{\nu y - \int_0^y \frac{\lambda(w)}{\rho(w)} dw} dy}{\int_0^\infty \frac{\lambda(y)}{\rho(y)} e^{\nu y - \int_0^y \frac{\lambda(w)}{\rho(w)} dw} dy} = \frac{\int_x^\infty \left(\nu + \frac{\lambda_0}{1+y}\right) \frac{1}{(1+y)^{\lambda_0}} dy}{\int_0^\infty \left(\nu + \frac{\lambda_0}{1+y}\right) \frac{1}{(1+y)^{\lambda_0}} dy} = \frac{\nu(1+x)^{-\lambda_0+1} + (\lambda_0 - 1)(1+x)^{-\lambda_0}}{\lambda_0 + \nu - 1}, \tag{5.12}$$

which is strictly between 0 and 1. In Figure 5, we plot the curve of the ruin



FIGURE 5. Illustration of the ruin probability without any investment (blue curve with circle markers), the minimized ruin probability with investment in research and development (red dashed curve). The x-axis denotes the initial wealth of the underlying company and the y-axis denotes the (minimized) ruin probability. x^* on the x-axis is the critical threshold above which the optimal strategy is to invest as much as possible in R&D, and below which the optimal strategy is not to invest at all in R&D. Here, we take $\rho_0 = 1$ (irrelevant), $\nu = 0.1$, $\lambda_0 = 1.2$, $\delta_0 = 0.4$, and $c_1 = c_2 = 1$ (irrelevant) and $\gamma = 1$.

probability as a function of the initial wealth without investment (blue curve with circle markers) and the minimized ruin probability as a function of the initial wealth with the optimal investment in research and development (red dashed curve) as in the example of the state-dependent dual risk model we described above. In Figure 5, the critical threshold for for the optimal investment strategy is $x^* = 3$ in the plot. When the wealth process is below this threshold x^*, the optimal strategy for investment in R&D is not to invest, and when the wealth process is above this threshold x^*, the optimal strategy for investment in R&D is to invest as aggressively

as possible. When $x < x^*$, from (3.21), we can see that $V(x)$ decays polynomially in x, and when $x > x^*$, from (3.20), we can see that $V(x)$ decays exponentially in x.

References

[1] Afonso, L. B., Cardoso, R. M. R. and A. D. Egídio dos Reis. (2013). Dividend problems in the dual risk model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **53**, 906-918.

[2] Albrecher, H., Badescu, A. and D. Landriault. (2008). On the dual risk model with tax payments. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **42**, 1086-1094.

[3] Avanzi, B., Cheung, E. C. K., Wong, B. and J. K. Woo. (2013). On a periodic dividend barrier strategy in the dual model with continuous monitoring of solvency. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **52**, 98-113.

[4] Avanzi, B., Gerber, H. U. and E. S. W. Shiu. (2007). Optimal dividends in the dual model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **41**, 111-123.

[5] Azcue, P. and N. Muler. (2009). Optimal investment strategy to minimize the ruin probability of an insurance company under borrowing constraints. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **44**, 26-34.

[6] Bayraktar, E. and M. Egami. (2008). Optimizing venture capital investment in a jump diffusion model. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*. **67**, 21-42.

[7] Bayraktar, E. and V. R. Young. (2007). Minimizing the probability of liftetime ruin under borrowing constraints. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **41**, 196-221.

[8] Browne, S. (1995). Optima investment policies for a firm with a random risk process: exponential utility and minimizing the probability of ruin. *Mathematics of Operations Research*. **20**, 937-958.

[9] Casey, M. and R. Hackett. The 10 biggest R&D spenders worldwide. *FORTUNE*. November 17, 2014.

[10] Cheung, E. C. K. (2012). A unifying approach to the analysis of business with random gains. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*. **2012**, 153-182.

[11] Cheung, E. C. K. and S. Drekic. (2008). Dividend moments in the dual risk model: exact and approximate approaches. *ASTIN Bulletin*. **38**, 399-422.

[12] Fleming, W. H. and H.M. Soner. *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.

[13] Gaier, J. and P. Grandits. (2002). Ruin probabilities in the presence of regularly varying tails and optimal investment. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **30**, 211-217.

[14] Gaier, J. and P. Grandits. (2004). Ruin probabilities and investment under interest force in the presence of regularly varying tails. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*. **2004**, 256-278.

[15] Gaier, J., Grandits, P. and W. Schachermayer. (2003). Asymptotic ruin probabilities and optimal investment. *Annals of Applied Probability*. **13**, 1054-1076.

[16] Gerber, H. U. (1979). *An Introduction to Mathematical Risk Theory*. S. S. Huébner Foundation Monograph, Series No. 8.

[17] Hipp, C. (2004). Asymptotics of ruin probabilities for controlled risk processes in the small claims case. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*. **2004**, 321-335.

[18] Hipp, C. and M. Plum. (2000). Optimal investment for insurers. *Insurace: Mathematics and Economics*. **27**, 215-228.

[19] Knott, A. M. The Trillion-Dollar R&D Fix. *Harvard Business Review*. May 2012 Issue.

[20] Liu, C S. and H. Yang. (2004). Optimal investment for an insurer to minimize its probability of ruin. *North American Actuarial Journal*. **8**, 11-31.

[21] Meyer, P. A. (1971). Demonstration simplifiee d'un theoreme de Knight. *Seminaire de probabilites de Strasbourg*. **5**, 191-195.

[22] Ng, A. C. Y. (2009). On a dual model with a dividend threshold. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **44**, 315-324.

[23] Ng, A. C. Y. (2010). On the upcrossing and downcrossing probabilities of a dual risk model with phase-type gains. *ASTIN Bulletin* **40**, 281-306.

[24] Paulsen, J. (2008). Ruin models with investment income. *Probability Surveys*. **5**, 416-434.

[25] S. D. Promislow and V. R. Young. (2005). Minimizing the probability of ruin when claims follow Brownian motion with drift. *North American Actuarial Journal*. **9**, 110-128.

[26] Rodríguez, E., Cardoso, R. M. R. and A. D. Egídio dos Reis. (2015). Some advances on the Erlang(n) dual risk model. *ASTIN Bulletin*. **45**, 127-150.
[27] Schmidli, H. (2002). On minimizing the ruin probability by investment and reinsurance. *Annals of Applied Probability*. **12**, 890-907.
[28] Schmidli, H. (2005). On optimal investment and subexponential claims. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **36**, 25-35.
[29] Yang, C. and K. P. Sendova. (2014). The ruin time under the Sparre-Andersen dual model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **54**, 28-40.
[30] Yang, H. and L. Zhang. (2005). Optimal investment for insurer with jump-diffusion risk process. *Insurnace: Mathematics and Economics*. **37**, 615-634.
[31] Wang, Z., Xia, J. and L. Zhang. (2007). Optimal investment for an insurer: The martingale approach. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **40**, 322-334.
[32] Zhu, L. (2015). A state-dependent dual risk model. *arxiv:1510.03920*.

Department of Mathematics
Florida State University
1017 Academic Way
Tallahassee, FL-32306
United States of America
E-mail address: fahim@math.fsu.edu, zhu@math.fsu.edu